

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending but stand rejected. In a decision entered March 30, 2008, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences affirmed the Examiner's rejections of Claims 1-23. In light of the Board's reasoning, Independent Claims 1, 19, and 20 have been amended to overcome the rejections. In light of those amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and pass the application on to issuance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102: The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12, and 17-23 under §102 as being anticipated by US Pub. 2004/0205613 to Li. Li is directed to automatic transformation of data communicated between parties in a computing network. See, e.g., Li, Title and Abstract. As found by the Board, Li teaches using a template to transform a document. Li, paragraph [0057]. A style sheet accessible at a given URL is identified as the template which is used to transform XML documents to HTML pages. Li, paragraph [0065]. In other words, Li uses the terms template and style sheet interchangeably.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for providing imaging conversion services on content and, as amended, recites the following acts:

1. receiving a communication identifying content to be converted and a style sheet;
2. obtaining the content and style sheet identified by the communication;
3. discerning a format utilizing information obtained from a desired destination of converted content;
4. selecting, based on one or more of the obtained styles sheet and the discerned format, an imaging conversion program from a plurality of image conversion programs for use in converting the obtained content;

5. performing one or more of a filtering of the obtained content, a labeling of the obtained content, and a reordering of the obtained content as specified by the obtained style sheet;
6. converting the filtered, labeled, and/or reordered content using the selected imaging conversion program; and
7. transmitting the converted content to the desired destination.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify and distinguish between the style sheet and the imaging conversion program. The style sheet defines how content is to be filtered, labeled, and/or reordered. The imaging conversion program is responsible for converting the filtered, labeled, and/or reordered content to a desired format. Li, at best, describes utilizing a template, which Li equates with a style sheet, to transform an XML document to an HTML page. Li mentions nothing of:

- discerning a format utilizing information obtained from a desired destination of converted content
- selecting, based on one or more of the obtained styles sheet and the discerned format, an imaging conversion program from a plurality of image conversion programs for use in converting the obtained content; or
- performing one or more of a filtering of the obtained content, a labeling of the obtained content, and a reordering of the obtained content as specified by the obtained style sheet.

For at least this reason Claim 1 is patentable over Li as are Claims 2-18 and 21 which depend from Claim 1.

Claim 19 is directed to a system for implementing the method of Claim 1. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 19 and Claim 22 which depends from Claim 19.

Claim 20 is directed to a computer readable medium containing code for implementing the method of Claim 1. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 20 and Claim 23 which depends from Claim 20.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103: The Examiner rejected Claim 5 as being unpatentable over Li in view of USPN 6,785,022 issued to Todaka. Claim 5 depends from Claim 1 and includes all the limitations of that base Claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 5.

The Examiner rejected Claims 13-16 as being unpatentable over Li in view of a publication titled “Using Style Sheets to Publish XML to the Web.” Claims 13-16 each depends from Claim 1 and includes all the limitations of that base Claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claims 13-16.

Conclusion: In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson

By /Jack H. McKinney/
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

May 30, 2008